



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/816,537

04/01/2004

Michael H. Dunn

871462.00024.PA1242380US

9994

26710 7590 05/27/2008

QUARLES & BRADY LLP
411 E. WISCONSIN AVENUE
SUITE 2040
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-4497

EXAMINER

SHENG, TOM V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/27/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/816,537	Applicant(s) DUNN ET AL.	
	Examiner TOM V. SHENG	Art Unit 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-104 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 61-67 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 19-31, 37-52, 68-72 and 85-102 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 17, 18, 32-36, 53-60, 73-84, 103 and 104 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/12/08, 4/1/04, 8/7/07, 10/26/06, 12/5/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Objections

1. Claim 36 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 36: "erased removed" should be "erased".

Claim 44: "pull out window style" should be "pull-out window shade style".

Claim 45: "pull" should be "pull-out".

Claim 46: "pull out" should be "pull-out".

Claim 47: "pull out" should be "pull-out".

Claim 88: "a processor operable" should be "the processor operable".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As for claims 37 and 38, it is unclear how the screen width or height would be twice the space width or height since the screen is housed within the space. That is, the screen dimension is limited by the space dimension. Claim 39 is dependent on claim 38.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 2629

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-4, 9, 11, 22, 29, 30, 49, 68-69, 71, 88-91, 96 and 101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schaper (US 7,373,605 B2).

As for claim 1 and associated claims 49, 68, 88, Schaper teaches a presentation system (fig. 1-3) for presenting information to an audience within a space (display of data across multiple display screens; column 2 lines 32-34), the system comprising:

a communication network (network 14; fig. 1);

a control interface (linking areas 50, 52, 54 of a primary display screen 56; fig. 3);

a master presentation unit (column 3 lines 3-17) including a processor (coupled computer 102) and a master display screen (primary display screen 56), the master screen juxtaposed within the space so as to be viewable by the audience within the space (all the screens are viewable during a business presentation; column 1 lines 6-23), the processor (coupled computer 102) operable to transmit an image displayed on the master screen over the network upon user command issued via the control interface (by user selecting a portion of display data and dragging to a linking area, the portion of data is displayed at a corresponding secondary display screen; column 2 line 49 through column 3 line 1 and column 3 lines 42-53); and

at least a first slave presentation unit including a first slave image presenter (one of secondary display screens 58, 60 and 62) operable to receive and present images that are transmitted by the master unit to the first slave unit over the network to the audience within the space (as analyzed above; also see fig. 5; column 4 lines 43-50).

As for claims 2, 69, 89, another one of secondary display screens 58, 60 and 62 corresponds to claimed second slave presentation unit.

As for claims 3, 71, 90, the dragging of a portion of display data (an image) to a linking area and its corresponding display screen corresponds to claimed indication which of the slave units the image should be transmitted to.

As for claims 4, 91, Schaper teaches that the linking areas may be physical buttons (column 6 lines 18-22).

As for claim 9, each secondary display screen 58, 60 or 62 has its own screen surface.

As for claim 11, each display screen has a corresponding computer and thus its own graphics controller and also each display would inherently has its own display driver.

As for claims 22 and 96, the linking areas 50, 52, 54 are part of the primary display screen 56.

As for claims 29, 30 and 101, Schaper teaches that the network could be a wireless network (column 3 lines 13-17), inherently involving transmitter and receiver.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2629

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 5, 10, 12, 21, 31, 37-43, 50-52, 70, 85, 86, 87, 92, 95 and 102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaper.

As for claims 5, 21, 70, 92 and 95, Schaper does not teach that after an indication is received that an image is to be transmitted to a slave unit, the processor removes the image to be transmitted from the master display.

On the other hand, Schaper teaches that the images on the secondary display screens could be shifted from a first secondary display down. Moreover, after the shift, the first secondary display could be blanked (column 5 lines 46-56).

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that, even though the shifting is related to within secondary display screens, the shifting can similarly be provided from a primary display screen to the secondary display screens, especially in light of the use of backward, forward and scroll buttons 132, 134 and 138. That is, alternatively, the system can operate by simply shifting an image or sequence of images from the primary display screen down along the secondary display screens in order. Therefore, it would have been obvious to alternately provide a down shifting function as above as an additional feature.

As for claim 10, it is not clear whether the primary display screen 56 and secondary display screens 58, 60 and 62 are of the same size. On the other hand, this would be simply be a matter of design consideration and usage preference.

As for claims 12, 86 and 87, Schaper teaches the primary display screen as a projection display and the secondary display screens as flat-panel LCDs or PDPs. On the other hand, it is simply a matter of design criteria whether the secondary display screens could be projection displays as well.

As for claims 31 and 102, Schaper teaches redisplaying a second portion of data (currently displayed on the second secondary display screen by means of buttons 132, 134, 136 and 138) on the first secondary display screen (column 5 lines 41-45). Consequently, Schaper as modified would allow display of an image displayed by the slave presenter to be redisplayed by the master screen.

As for claims 37-39, the dimensions of the master screen are simply a matter of design consideration in optimizing viewing space.

As for claims 40-42, 50-52, the orientations and dimensions of the master and slave screens are simply a matter of design consideration in optimizing viewing space.

As for claim 43, the primary and secondary screens are meant to be within the same space and could be adjacent to each others.

Claim 85 is substantially rejected over the rationale of rejection for claims 1 and 5. Moreover, the utilization of one screen for two or more images via soft partition is well known in the art.

Art Unit: 2629

8. Claims 6-8, 23-28, 72, 93, 94 and 97-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaper as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Barton (US 2005/0193060 A1).

As for claims 6, 23 and 93, Schaper does not teach an augment interface by which a presenter may augment an image presented on the master screen. On the other hand, Barton teaches a projected image (by display unit 120) may be edited by a control unit 130 (fig. 1 and 2; paragraph 26). One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize Barton's editing feature could be incorporated into Schaper's system and is beneficial in allowing a presentation image to be enhanced in real time as necessary. Therefore, it would have obvious to add Barton's editing feature as an enhancement to Schaper's system.

As for claims 7, 24 and 94, the moving of the cursor and corresponding editing correspond to claimed activity intended to interact with the master screen.

As for claim 8, the adding or erasing of information is what editing is all about.

As for claims 25, 26, 97 and 98, Barton teaches an embodiment where the control unit 130 is separate from the display unit 120 (master display) and communicates wirelessly (via the document exchange unit 110, which could be part of the display unit 20).

As for claims 27 and 99, Barton teaches that the control unit 130 has a display 132 for preview.

As for claims 28 and 100, once the display data is sent to the shared memory 112, it is available for display on display unit 120.

Claim 72 is similarly rejected over the rationale of rejections for claims 6 and 7.

9. Claims 13-16, 19, 20 and 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaper as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ayers et al. (US 5,038,158).

As for claim 13, Schaper does not teach the structure of the slave image presenter as claimed. Ayers teaches an erasable roller-type display (fig. 1 and 2). Specifically, the display has a roller 31, printer head 34, sheet feed motor 33 that correspond to claimed roll member, print applicator and motivator, respectively (column 5 lines 9-20). One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that Ayers' display could similarly be used as one of Schaper's secondary displays and is advantageous in providing a feel of hand-drawn chart. Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate Ayers' display as one secondary display of Schaper, providing a feel of a hand-drawn chart in presentation.

As for claim 14, the roller 31 rolls display sheet 22 that reads on claimed sheet of paper.

As for claims 15 and 16, it is not clear whether the primary display screen 56 and secondary display screens 58, 60 and 62 are of the same size. On the other hand, this would be simply be a matter of design consideration and usage preference.

As for claims 19 and 20, the display sheet 22 of Ayers is erasable. However, the erase is by means of a charged cleaning brush 66 and not erasable ink. On the other hand, the application of a cleaning agent is well known in the art and is merely an

Art Unit: 2629

alternative to erasing content on a sheet medium. Moreover, the concurrent erasing and writing of content on a sheet medium is well known.

As for claims 44-47, Ayer's display is a pull-out endless loop type. However, this is simply a matter a design consideration for the four display styles as claimed are all well known in the art.

As for claim 48, it is a matter of design consideration based on esthetics, functionality and portability on how the different displays should be provided.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 61-67 are allowed.

11. Claims 17, 18, 32-36, 53-60, 73-81, 82-84 and 103-104 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

12. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: none of the prior art of record teaches, inter alia, the correlation between the presentation unit and the images presented, as claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TOM V. SHENG whose telephone number is (571)272-7684. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 6:00pm.

Art Unit: 2629

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on (571) 272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tom Sheng

/Richard Hjerpe/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629